



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,062	06/29/2006	Cunat Christophe	FR04 0005 US1	6205
65913	7550	05/29/2008		
NXP, B.V. NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE SAN JOSE, CA 95131				
EXAMINER MEROUAN, ABDERRAHIM				
ART UNIT 2628		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 05/29/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/585,062

Applicant(s)

CHRISTOPHE ET AL.

Examiner

ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN

Art Unit

4192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U. S. C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows:

Claim 11 fails to fall within a statutory category of invention. It is directed to the program itself, not a process occurring as a result or executing the program, a machine programmed to operate in accordance with the program nor a manufacture structurally and functionally interconnected with the program in a manner which enables the program to act as a computer component and realize its functional interconnected clearly not directed to a composition of matter. Therefore, it's non-statutory under 35 USC 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2628

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,5, 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Lechat et al (U.S Patent 6999629 B1) hereinafter referred as Lechat
As per claim 1 Lechat teaches:

A method of mapping an input image split into input triangles including texels onto (Lechat, Column 11, lines 21 to 25)an output image also split into corresponding output triangles including pixels(Lechat, Column 5, lines 21 to 25; and Column 10, lines 15 to 16), said method comprising the steps of:
determining an inverse affine transform for transforming(Lechat, Column 3, line 61) an intermediate rectangle triangle into an input triangle(Lechat, Column 3, lines 61 to 64)
determining a direct affine transform for transforming (Lechat, Column 4, lines 5 to 6) the intermediate rectangle triangle into an output triangle(Lechat, Column 4, lines 7 to 13)
applying the inverse affine transform(Lechat, Column 3, line 61) to intermediate points of the intermediate rectangle triangle (Lechat, Column 3, lines 61 to 64," A triangle is a

Art Unit: 2628

set of points") so as to determine intermediate intensity values corresponding to said intermediate points on the basis of input intensity values of texels; (Lechat, Column 10, lines 1 to 5) and

applying the direct affine transform (Lechat, Column 4, lines 5 to 6) to the intermediate points (Lechat, Column 4, lines 7 to 13, "A triangle is a set of points") so as to determine output intensity values of pixels (Lechat, Column 9, lines 35 to 36) on the basis of the intermediate intensity values (Lechat, Column 9, lines 34 to 35).

3. Arguments used to reject 9 are analogous to arguments used to reject claim 1.
4. Arguments used to reject 10 are analogous to arguments used to reject claim 9.
5. As per claim 5, Lachat teaches: A method as claimed in claim 1, claim 5 adds into claim 1:

wherein the step of applying the direct affine transform (Lechat, Column 4, lines 5 to 6) is adapted to transform an intermediate point into an output transformed point in the output triangle (Lechat, Column 4, lines 7 to 13, "A triangle is a set of points"), and to determine, for said intermediate point, a contribution to output intensity values of pixels (Lechat, Column 9, lines 35 to 36) surrounding said output transformed point on the basis of the intermediate intensity value. (Lechat, Column 9, lines 34 to 35).

6. As per claim 7 Lachat teaches: A method as claimed in claim 1, claim 7 adds into claim 1:

Art Unit: 2628

further comprising a step of dividing the output triangle into two sub-triangles(Lechat, Column 3, lines 60 to 64) before the step of applying the direct affine transform. (Lechat, Column 4, lines 4 to 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2 - 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lechat et al (U.S Patent 6999629 B1) hereinafter referred as Lechat as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Fowler et al (U.S Patent 6339428 B1) hereinafter referred as Fowler.

9. As per claim 2 Lechat teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the step of applying the inverse affine transform is adapted to transform(Lechat, Column 3, line 61) an intermediate point into an input transformed point the input triangle(Lechat, Column 4, lines 7 to 8, "A triangle is a set of points"), and to determine, for said intermediate point, an intermediate intensity value(Lechat, Column 10, lines 1 to 5)

Art Unit: 2628

Lechat doesn't teach:

based on a filtering operation of texels surrounding the input transformed point.

Fowler teaches:

based on a filtering operation of texels(Fowler, Column 3, lines 25 to 26) surrounding the input transformed point. (Fowler, Column 3, lines 15 to 17)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Fowler into Lechat since Lechat did not suggest the filtering operation of texels, and Fowler suggests the beneficial use of the filtering operation of texels such to determine the pixel color value by determining the weighted average of the closest four texel instead of big number of texels.

10. As per claim 3 Lechat teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 2

Lechat doesn't teach

wherein the filtering operation comprises a bilinear interpolation using four texels surrounding the input transformed point.

Fowler teaches:

wherein the filtering operation comprises a bilinear interpolation using four texels surrounding the input transformed point. (Fowler, Column 3, lines 13 to 30)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Fowler into Lechat since Lechat did not suggest the filtering operation of texels, and Fowler suggests the beneficial use of

Art Unit: 2628

the filtering operation of texels such to determine the pixel color value by determining the weighted average of the closest four texel instead of big number of texels.

11. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lechat et al (U.S Patent 6999629 B1) hereinafter referred as Lechat, in view of Fowler et al (U.S Patent 6339428 B1) hereinafter referred as Fowler, as applied to claim 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Zandi et al (U.S Patent 6219458 B1) hereinafter referred as Zandi.

12. As per claim 4 Lechat in view of Fowler teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 2

Lechat in view of Fowler doesn't teach:

wherein the filtering operation comprises

applying sequentially a first mono-dimensional finite impulse response filter in a horizontal direction and a second mono-dimensional finite impulse response filter in a vertical direction.

Zandi teaches:

applying sequentially a first mono-dimensional (Zandi, Column 6, line 39) finite impulse response filter(Zandi, Column 5, line 66) in a horizontal direction(Zandi, Column 6, line 39) and a second mono-dimensional finite impulse response filter in a vertical direction(Zandi, Column 6, lines 39 and 40)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Zandi into Lechat in view of Fowler since Lechat in view of Fowler did not suggest the finite impulse response filter, and Zandi suggests the beneficial use of the finite impulse response filter such for efficient filtering.

13. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lechat et al (U.S Patent 6999629 B1) hereinafter referred as Lechat, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mochizuki et al (U.S Patent 5903273) hereinafter referred as Mochizuki.

14. As per claim 6, Lechat teaches: A method as claimed in claim 1

Lechat doesn't teach

further comprising a step of determining lengths of the intermediate rectangle triangle opposite to the hypotenuse which are equal to a power of 2 greater than the length of corresponding edges the output triangle.

Mochizuki teaches:

further comprising a step of determining lengths of the intermediate rectangle triangle opposite to the hypotenuse which are equal to a power of 2 greater than the length of corresponding edges the output triangle.(Mochizuki, Column 15, lines 53 to 55)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Mochizuki into Lechat in since Lechat did not suggest the size limitation, and Mochizuki suggests the beneficial use of the size limitation such for more speed when computing.

15. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lechat et al (U.S Patent 6999629 B1) hereinafter referred as Lechat, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Koen Meinds and Bart Barenbrug (Resample Hardware for 3D Graphics) hereinafter referred as Meinds

16. As per claim 8: Lechat teaches: A method as claimed in claim 1
Lechat doesn't teach

,wherein: the step of applying the direct affine transform is adapted to determine an output point and a corresponding output surface in the output triangle from an intermediate point and a corresponding intermediate unitary surface to determine a pixel with integer coordinates belonging to the output surface, and to determine an output vector defined by the output point and the pixel with integer coordinates; and the step of applying the inverse affine transform is adapted to determine an input transformed point in the input triangle from the intermediate point and the output vector, and to filter the input intensity values of texels surrounding said input transformed point so as to derive an output intensity value of the pixel with integer coordinates.

Meinds teaches:

,wherein: the step of applying the direct affine transform is adapted to determine an output point (Meinds, page 19, Section 2.2, lines 1 to 3) and a corresponding output surface in the output triangle from an intermediate point (Meinds, page 19, Section 2.2, lines 7 to 8)and a corresponding intermediate unitary surface to determine a pixel with integer coordinates belonging to the output surface (Meinds, page 19, Section 2.1, line

Art Unit: 2628

9 "(Ut, Vt) is the texture coordinate...."), and to determine an output vector defined by the output point and the pixel with integer coordinates; (Meinds, page 19, Section 2.2, Figure 3)

and the step of applying the inverse affine transform is adapted to determine an input transformed point in the input triangle from the intermediate point Meinds, page 19, Section 2.1, lines 4 to 5, "With inverse texture mapping...") and the output vector (Meinds, page 19, Section 2.1, Figure 1) , and to filter the input intensity values of texels surrounding said input transformed point so as to derive an output intensity value of the pixel with integer coordinates. (Meinds, page 19, Figure 2, and Section 2.1, lines 12 to 18, "Rasterization of the polygon.....")

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Meinds into Lechat in since Lechat did not suggest the details of determining of the output point, and the pixel , and Meinds suggests the beneficial use of the details of determining of the output point, and the pixel such for a faster filtering process .

17. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lechat et al (U.S. Patent 6999629 B1) hereinafter referred as Lechat, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fowler et al (US Patent 6339428 B1) hereinafter referred as Fowler.

Lechat teaches: a method as claimed in claim 1.

Lechat doesn't teach:

Art Unit: 2628

A computer program product comprising program instructions for implementing, when said program is executed by a processor.

Fowler teaches:

A computer program product comprising program instructions for implementing, when said program is executed by a processor, (Fowler, Column 7, lines 55 to 60).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Fowler into Lechat in since Lechat did not suggest a computer program product, and Fowler suggests the beneficial use of a computer program to implement the method as claimed in claim 1.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xiao Wu can be reached on (571) - 272-7761. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Abderrahim Merouan

Patent Examiner

AU: 2628

/XIAO M. WU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628